

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ALENA KRILEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLIE BROWNE, JAMIE PHIFER,
STAFF MEMBER UNKNOWN NAME,
ALL WOMEN'S CARE,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:21-cv-01176-JHC

ORDER

Before the Court are pro se Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Deadline, Dkt. # 123, and "3d Motion for Appointment of Pro Bono Counsel," Dkt. # 125. The Court has considered the materials filed in support of and in opposition to the motions, the rest of the file, and the governing law. Being fully advised, for the reasons below, the Court DENIES both motions.

1. Request for Another Extension of Expert Disclosure Deadline


Regardless of the procedural issue raised by Defendants relating to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A), there is no good cause for the requested extension. This case, which has been pending for well over three years, has dragged on long enough. Plaintiff has had more than ample time to obtain her medical records and retain expert witnesses. Absent extraordinary circumstances, the Court will not grant any further extensions in this case.

2. Third Request for Appointment of Counsel

Plaintiff again does not present exceptional circumstances warranting such appointment. She does not show a likelihood of success of the merits. And for a self-represented party, she has displayed relative sophistication in presenting legal arguments. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. # 128 at 2-3 (arguing that LCR 7(j) is inconsistent with Rule 6(b)(1)(A)). Granted, while counsel may be better able to pursue Plaintiff's claims, on balance, the situation here hardly presents exceptional circumstances to justify the requested appointment.

For the above reasons, the Court DENIES the motions.

Dated this 6th day of December, 2024.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John H. Chun", is positioned above a solid horizontal line.

John H. Chun
United States District Judge